THE Reconstructionist

Vol. XI. November 2, 1945 Heshvan 26, 5706 No. 12

EDITORIALS
- *How Control Atomic Energy?*
- *The Ibn Saud Correspondence*
- *Why Not Make Equality a "Prevailing Custom?"*

INTER-FAITH RELATIONS AND HOW TO IMPROVE THEM
By Ira Eisenstein

EDUCATION AND RELIGION IN THE HOME
By Asher Block

THE CENTRALITY OF FUND-RAISING
By Gershon Gelbart

REALITIES AND VALUES

Dedicated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of Israel's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $2.00 per year; 10c per copy; foreign 25c extra; membership in the Foundation, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**

Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**

Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Nathan E. Cohen, Samuel Dinin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Solomon Goldman, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Philip Houtz, Samuel C. Kohs, Milton R. Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfield, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Miriam R. Ephraim, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin, Robert Gordis, Louis M. Levitsky, Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, David Polish, Edward T. Sandrow, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Max Weine, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

▼

ASHER BLOCK is Rabbi of Temple Israel of Great Neck, N. Y., and contributing editor to the RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

▼

GERSHON GELBART was Executive Director of the Jewish Community Center, Port Chester, New York, and is now overseas for the Joint Distribution Committee.

Reports and Addresses delivered at the Annual Conference of the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation on Saturday and Sunday, October 13 and 14th, will be published in subsequent issues.

▼

ORDER YOUR COPY NOW!

THE SABBATH PRAYER BOOK

IS SELLING FAST

A limited supply is still available

Order your copy now

for use in the Synagogue and in the Home.

$2.00 per copy — $1.65 per copy for orders of fifty and over.

THE JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.,
15 West 86th St., New York 24, N. Y.

Please send me.....copies of the SABBATH PRAYER BOOK.

Name .....

Address .....

THE Reconstructionist

Vol. XI. November 2, 1945 Heshvan 26, 5706 No. 12

EDITORIALS

HOW CONTROL ATOMIC ENERGY?

THE world is faced with problems galore: reconversion, occupation of defeated countries, revival of trade, international loans, civil wars — to mention but a few. But all these problems dwindle into insignificance before the problem of atomic energy, without any doubt the most vital, pressing problem of our age. The question what to do with this new power, which human intelligence has uncovered, is the prime moral question before the world. If the leaders of civilization muff this one, it will be the end. If they produce the proper solution, it will be the beginning of a new world. In either case, the world will never again be the same as it was before the summer of 1945.

After some months of discussion, several things have become clear. One is that any effort on the part of the United States to keep the method of releasing atomic energy a secret is doomed. Hundreds of scientists who, themselves, worked on the mystery of the atom, have testified that we Americans have no monopoly on brains and that other nations are bound to have the "secret" before long. To be sure, until the other nations learn the know-how, we Americans will have the advantage. But in the interval, we shall be building up a mutual distrust and suspicion and hate which must inevitably explode all the worse when the striking powers are evened up.

"Let the other nations attack us," some say; "we can learn to defend ourselves." Again the scientists discourage those who persist in evading realities. There is no defense against the atomic bomb, especially if fifth-columnists plant them in peaceful times, all set to be exploded suddenly and fatally when the proper moment comes.

"Let us have an international understanding," some say; "we shall refrain from using atomic bombs if others will promise to do likewise." Unfortunately, this suggestion too does not seem to answer the problem. It has that flat and familiar sound, like "Geneva Convention." World War II proved that only the gentlemen observed the convention; and gentlemen are rare among aggressors. It is true that poison gas was not used during the war just ended, but little encouragement can be derived from that fact. According to our best information, the Japanese and the Germans refrained from using poison gas because they had never perfected a method whereby they

could fire it without risking the danger of having it blown back in their own faces.

One proposal is heard more and more frequently these days, one which seems to strike off in a new direction, with a boldness commensurate with the gigantic stature of the problems. That proposal is that we now establish a *world government,* and place the control of the atom in the hands of a commission responsible to this new international state. This proposal makes sense. Since the advent of world wars, it has been the only logical solution to the problem of war. Naturally, there are tremendous obstacles in the way of realizing a world state, not the least of which is the necessity for surrendering national sovereignty. But mankind is beginning to understand (we hope) that any devices which disregard this necessity are valueless. The world only fools itself if it attempts any less fundamental solution.

Yet, we have misgivings. Granted that a world state could be set up tomorrow (as long as we are at it), would mankind be safe from the misuse of atomic energy? People tend to look at the world state as to a messiah, a panacea, a *s'gulah* for all the ills. They should understand that it too is a device, as perfect or imperfect as the men and women who administer it. War is a condition between *people,* not only between states, and there are many kinds of war, civil war, class war, religious war. There is no guarantee, for the present, that a world state will not have its civil war. At this moment, Argentina and Venezuela are each in the heat of civil war; that each constitutes a state has not been enough of a preventive.

So perhaps there is one more feature to the plan that should be added. *The world state would have to outlaw* the use of atomic energy for a reasonable time, until world conditions have settled down, until men and women grow accustomed to the idea that they belong to one world. Then atomic energy could be released for use, for industry and for medicine. Until then, however, no factory could be built which might be used for making anything that utilizes atomic energy. The formulae should be preserved—but not used, for at least a generation. In the meantime, the world should concentrate on developing *human beings.*

THE IBN SAUD CORRESPONDENCE

SECRETARY of State Byrnes issued, on Thursday, October 19th, an official statement on the policy of the American government toward Palestine. In this statement, he reiterated the policy laid down by President Roosevelt last April, which the late President formulated in a letter to King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia. In that letter, President Roosevelt said that "no decision (will) be taken with respect to the basic situation in that country (Palestine) without full consultation with both Arabs and Jews," and that he would take no action "which might prove hostile to the Arab people."

American Zionists have every reason to be shocked by this statement of "policy." It certainly does not square with what they have been led to believe was actually the policy of the Roosevelt administration. The Democratic Party platform read: "We favor the opening of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish immigration and colonization, and such a policy as to result in the establishment there of a free and democratic Jewish commonwealh." That was in June, 1944. In October of the same year, President Roosevelt quoted this statement and added: "I know how long and ardently the Jew-

ish people have worked and prayed for the establishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth. I am convinced that the American people give their support to this aim and if re-elected I shall help to bring about its realization.

It is, alas, too late now to ask President Roosevelt how, in the light of his statement in October, 1944, he could have written to Ibn Saud as he did in April, 1945. What happened in the interval? The only intimation we have of an experience that might have influenced him is his meeting with Ibn Saud, on his return from Yalta. The President said at that time something about having learned more from Ibn Saud in five minutes than he had been able to learn from other sources over long periods of time. If it was Ibn Saud who changed the President's mind, then the letter from Ibn Saud to the President, dated March 10, 1945, assumes extraordinary significance. That letter was published simultaneously with the President's reply of April 5th. What does this letter contain?

That letter, in our opinion, is the most flagrantly false presentation of history that one can conceive. It seems to have been written on the basis of the Hitlerian assumption that the bigger the lie, the better chance of its being believed. According to Ibn Saud, Canaan was settled first by Canaanites, who were Arabs; they held it uninterruptedly until our time, except for a brief and insignificant period when the Jews ruled the land. The Arabs, therefore, have the historic claim to the land, not the Jews. Thus, Ibn Saud, in spite of the clear wording of the Preamble to the Mandate for Palestine, to which practically all the civilized nations subscribed: "Whereas recognition has thereby (by the Balfour Declaration) been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country. . . ."

The Jews today, says Ibn Saud, "are preparing to create a form of Nazi-fascism within sight and hearing of the democracies and in the midst of the Arab countries, as well as in their very heart and in the heart of the East which has proved itself loyal to the Allied cause in these critical times." "The Jews," he asserts, "are taking hostile action against Britain while under her protection and mercy." Thus Ibn Saud, in spite of the fact that Jews were fighting side by side with the British, forgetting the White Paper, the *Struma* and the *Patria,* while the Arabs sabotaged and revolted. The Arab leaders connived with the fascists, while Jews poured out their blood to destroy fascism. . . . Thus it goes on — a tissue of lies. Is it really necessary to continue refuting what is so obviously false?

The question then is: was American policy shaped on the basis of the interview which this letter summarizes, on the basis of the "five minutes" which drew President Roosevelt's praise? Is this the policy which our government intends to follow? Do Mr. Truman and Mr. Byrnes still think the Arabs will consent to talk things over? Do they think that the Arabs will not consider the admission of even a single Jew a "hostile" act?

Obviously, Mr. Truman and Mr. Byrnes are not dealing openly and forthrightly with the Jewish people. They are acting more "innocent" of realities than is consistent with true innocence. What are they withholding, and why? Are they committed to certain oil deals, in which the big oil companies are involved? Are they shielding the British who are, in truth, the creators of the Arab League and its greatest beneficiary? Are they unwilling to make of justice to the Jew a test of international justice?

We believe that Zionists would prefer

to know the truth, the whole truth, as ugly as it might turn out to be, rather than to be tortured like Tantalus. Let the truth come out, and then there can be appeal to the conscience of all good Americans. At the present, the situation has been greatly worsened by the publication of the Ibn Saud correspondence. These letters have muddied the waters.

Secretary Byrnes has said: "There is general agreement that it is our duty to take energetic measures to assist these unfortunate victims of Nazi persecution." If he means that, the State Department will forge a truthful and energetic policy and not continue to hide behind the double talk of posthumous correspondence.

WHY NOT MAKE EQUALITY A "PREVAILING CUSTOM?"

THE Daughters of the American Revolution are proud of their ancestry. But somehow their pride does not express itself in emulating the virtues of their ancestors. The fathers of these women were genuine revolutionaries. They fought a war which was not merely a struggle for survival, or even for independence, but an ideological war. That it was so conceived is evident from the fact that those who declared it felt called upon to issue a manifesto, the famous manifesto that goes by the name of the Declaration of Independence. That manifesto contains a solemn affirmation of faith: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal."

"All men" means *all* men and not only White men. The same precious red blood was shed in that war by *all* the men who sacrificed their lives in it, and one would think that, after another war in which Black and White men bled and died together, the Daughters of the Revolution would have remembered the principles for which that war was fought.

But, if there is any blood in the veins of the Daughters of the American Revolution it is blue blood, not red. A pernicious anemia of snobbishness has destroyed all its red corpuscles so that today it shows no trace of the ruddy hue of revolution. That is the inference which we must draw from the refusal of the DAR to permit Constitution Hall, which is its property, to be used for a concert featuring the pianist Hazel Scott, the wife of Representative Adam C. Powell, Jr., because she is a Negro.

The DAR justifies its action on the ground that it was conforming to "prevailing custom," but if the fathers of these Daughters of Revolution had respected "prevailing custom" more than liberty and equality, they would never have raised a hand against the time honored institution of British royalty. The plea that segregation does not mean inequality is a bit of transparent hypocrisy. Can there be any motive other than the desire to keep the Negro down in distinguishing between Black and White in respect to art?

There is but one answer to the action of the DAR and that is for every decent American woman who resents the profanation of American democracy to have nothing to do with such an unpatriotic organization. Eleanor Roosevelt had the courage to register her protest against its undemocratic racialism on a similar occasion, when the DAR would not let Marion Anderson use Constitution Hall. She resigned forthwith from the organization, and that is exactly what Mrs. Truman should do now. Not to do so is to insult the entire Negro citizenry. If Negroes are good enough to fight and die for America they are good enough to enjoy full social, cultural and economic equality in American life, and the snobs who snub them should be snubbed.

REALITIES AND VALUES

A NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE has made its appearance: "Commentary." The American Jewish Committee publishes it, having incorporated into the new periodical its "Contemporary Jewish Record." The "Record" was an excellent bi-monthly, containing valuable articles and documents of lasting interest. "Commentary" is a monthly, and, under the able editorship of Elliott E. Cohen, promises to be a vigorous forum of present-day Jewish life. Welcome, "Commentary."

▼

THE ANNOUNCEMENT THAT Dr. Abram Sachar is taking on the job of B'nai B'rith's overall youth program is indeed a welcome one. It deserves bigger headlines than most of the domestic news that comes in. The education of adolescents is perhaps the one, most vital area on which ought to be concentrated the best pedagogic and inspirational talents. From that group will come, during the next decades, the leaders of American Jewry and, of course, the followers. All efforts for relief, defense and good-will may be fruitless if the teen-agers of today do not become ardent Jewish adults tomorrow. We hope Dr. Sacher will provide a program for the youth which will revive in them their will to live a maximum Jewish life.

▼

THE RABBIS ARE ALWAYS WORrying about how to get their people to observe Sabbaths and festivals. Well, the answer has come, at last . . . and from Philadelphia. This is the news dispatch: "Agnes Murphy is observing all Jewish holidays from now on. She is secretary of a real estate firm here. The office was closed during the recent Yom Kippur observance. Because she did not have to report to work that day, she was not on the bus she regularly takes to work which, on that day, was wrecked in a crash injuring many passengers."

▼

MR. JOHN O'DONNELL OF the New York *Daily News*, after "careful investigation," discovered that his attack on the Jews was unwarranted. This discovery came after the publisher of the *News* discovered that the Jews of New York were not going to take anti-Semitism lying down. It was a terrific gamble, and the stakes were very high. If the Jews had remained silent, no one can tell what might have been the next step in the drive against the Jews. Vigilance must ever be the watchword.

▼

NATIONAL BIBLE WEEK WAS observed, October 15-21, in over 100 cities throughout the nation. The mayors of the cities broadcast special messages. In New York City, the buses carried posters, urging people to read the Bible. In Missouri, the Gideons group distributed 3,000 Bibles to school children, and promise that they will continue until every child in Missouri has received a copy. All this is quite commendable — but how efficacious is it? Is the Bible the sort of book that a child — or an adult — can sit down and read? Without the proper commentary and interpretation, the child-like reader gets the impression that the Book is filled with unscientific data, anti-Semitic tirades by the Prophets, unintelligible commands, etc. Of course, there is no objection to having the Bible distributed; but let none be deceived by the number of copies in circulation. True piety, morality, tolerance and good will are not achieved merely by handing out Bibles.

▼

Short History of the Jews: 750 B.C.E., Amos of Tekoa preaches justice. Predicts exile for Israel, with ultimate return to the land. 1945, twenty

youths arrive in Palestine from Bergen-Belsen, go to work building a colony. October 10, 1945: Chief Rabbi Herzog and guests come to dedicate the colony, located at Tekoa.

▼

WORTH WHILE REMEMBERING, from the address of Judge Simon Rifkind at the Jewish Theological Seminary: "Not only is Judaism my faith but I have faith in Judaism. I have faith in its capacity to enhance the value and dignity of the human personality, to nourish human brotherhood, to cultivate a willing subjection to morality and justice, to foster humility and mercy and love, to keep in high esteem learning and intellectual honesty, to mould its adherents to prefer the ways of peace, of social justice and democracy."

Inter-Faith Relations and How to Improve Them

By IRA EISENSTEIN

RELATIONS between religious groups in America are far from satisfactory. Suspicion, hatred and discrimination are rife. Protestants line up against Catholics; each of these groups turns against Jews. Often the members of one group are antagonistic to members of the same group who differ in belief or practice. As we enter upon the post-war period, we Americans can ill afford the tensions and disunity which result. We shall have economic and political adjustments of prime importance to make, and shall have to come to decisions on international questions which may determine the course of world history for generations to come, if not for ever. If we fail to solve the vexing problem of inter-faith relations, we shall not only cause ourselves much distress and pain, but also distract ourselves from sober consideration of great problems.

Inter-faith relations are of serious moment particularly now, because our country is entering upon a period which will undoubtedly be one of painful reorientation. The war has been won, but victory has brought us innumerable problems of an economic and political nature. Whenever economic and political issues are at stake, unscrupulous men resort to any means to gain an advantage, and will not hesitate to exploit real or potential antagonisms between members of differing races and creeds. We have seen how destructive of national unity and progress such dissensions can be, especially when instigated and magnified by those who seek power.

The Inadequacy of Most Good-Will Efforts

The problem is, of course, not new in the United States. At various times in our history, Catholics, Protestants and Jews have come in for their share of persecution. Sporadic efforts, mostly of the hortatory type, have been exerted to reduce inter-faith friction, but not until the twenties of this century have organized campaigns been set in motion to deal with the question. Today, there are the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Council Against Intolerance, and numerous other agencies seeking to improve inter-faith relations. Yet, after all these years, the problem seems to be as pressing as ever. For a short time after Pearl Harbor, we are told, relations improved considerably; then they deteriorated again. They may even have become worse than before December 7, 1941. Thus na-

tional danger, war-time living standards and other economic and political conditions determine the improvement or deterioration of inter-faith relations. Obviously, the question has not been dealt with effectively.

The basic inadequacy of most organized "good-will" movements has been their failure to study the fundamental causes of inter-religious friction. They have been mainly attempts to bring men and women of differing faiths together, either to enlist their cooperation in some enterprise outside their respective religions, or to achieve better "understanding" by studying one another's faith. The former procedure succeeds in diverting everyone's attention for a while from the problem of their mutual relations; the latter confirms each in his own faith, armed, now, with enough knowledge of his neighbor's to know precisely why his neighbor's religion is inferior. At no time (or rarely) is the root cause of the trouble brought to the surface.

The Root Cause of Interfaith Hostility

That root cause, stated briefly, is the contention of each of the three major religious groups that *it* is the sole possessor of the truth. Each religion is, by its very nature, exclusive of all the rest. Each group assumes that there can be only one true or legitimate religion — its own. Because of this, each believes the problems of the world will never be solved until *all* mankind adopts the one true faith. There can never be peace, justice and love in the world unless they be attained by means of God's unique revelation. That revelation each claims to have received exclusively.

The result is that each faith must regard all others as "error," which must sooner or later be eliminated. The elimination of "error" can be achieved through education, propaganda and missionizing. In the past, the ambition to convert the world to a particular faith has led to tragic consequences, for peaceful suasion was not always successful, and other means were resorted to. Political, economic and social sanctions were used; and sometimes the torch had to be applied.

Although religious groups in contemporary America are no longer inclined to use force, they are nevertheless committed to the fundamental proposition, from which they have not deviated. That proposition is that their respective religions are the only true ones, or, at least, are possessed of such an overwhelming degree of the truth that salvation for mankind will not be achieved until everyone is converted to the true faith.

The Christian Church is still committed to the proposition that Christianity must become the religion of all mankind before we can hope to see the world perfected. "The Gospel is the only way of salvation. . . . Its very nature forbids us to say that it may be the right belief for some, but not for others." Unless all become Christians and teach the truths of the "life complete and abundant" on the basis of the Christian Gospels, they cannot be said to have qualified for true salvation.

To be sure, "rays" from the "light" have penetrated even non-Christian religions; but partial faith is not sufficient. "All the good of which men have conceived is fulfilled and secured in Christ"; Christianity is, in the words of one Christian leader, "not a religion, but *religion.*"*

Most Christian denominations, therefore, continue to subsidize missions. The greater proportion of missionary energy is expended on foreign soil; but a good deal is directed toward converting unbelievers who are to be found close at

* "The Christian Life and Message in Relation to non-Christian Systems of Thought and Life," Vol. I. Chap. XIII, "The Christian Message."

hand. This missionary activity creates friction. Those who are missionized call the missionizers "intolerant," and those who missionize regard as intolerant the people who resist them.

Strangely enough the friction is caused by the non-proselytizing attitude as well as by the proselytizing attitude. The Jews in the United States have been criticized as exclusive and particularistic because of their refusal to engage in proselytizing. The Jews theoretically are a missionary people. Traditionally, Judaism looked forward to achieving spiritual hegemony over the whole world. The Messianic era was pictured as one in which everyone would acknowledge the God of Israel. In modern times, the Orthodox movement retained this Messianic hope in the liturgy but permitted its implications to lapse into desuetude. The Reform movement is committed to the ideal of Israel's mission to be realized through the example set by the exemplary lives of the Jews. But, truth to tell, no program has ever been worked out to implement the terms of the mission, mainly because the entire plan is so unrealistic. For practical purposes, Judaism is not a missionary religion.

Nevertheless, Judaism as well as Christianity still clings to the belief in the "chosenness" of its system of salvation, and even when no action is taken to seek converts, the avowed insistence on the possession of unique truth serves to create the climate in which intolerance flourishes.

The suggestion that contemporary religions abandon this basic doctrine is generally met with serious opposition. No religion, it is claimed, which professes to be a universal one can posssibly surrender the hope that it will ultimately become *the* religion of mankind. In a democracy, competition between religions is as legitimate as competition in business. Let each religion appeal to the masses, presenting its virtues as clearly as possible, and eventually the best religion will drive out the inferior ones.

The True Basis of Interfaith Accord

The truth is, however, that religions are not acquired like radios. People do not change their religions easily. They are born into them, raised in them, and have their being in the social group which shares a common religion. In order to understand the peculiar relations of individuals to their religion, it is necessary to understand more about the function of religion in a civilization.

Religion is an aspect of a culture or a civilization. *It is the self-consciousness of a group expressed in that group's orientation to the cosmos, to society as a whole, to history. The religion of a group is the unique articulation, in terms of the historic experience of the group, of those values which constitute its highest ideals. The values which a group cherishes and the means which it provides for the realization of those values constitute the "salvation" it offers its adherents. The rites, ceremonies, and liturgy which the group develops are the characteristic expressions of those ideals and values. The expressions are characteristic of a group but the ideals and values themselves are universal.*

Now, religious groups are not necessarily different from one another; they may be just "other." If, for example, the values cherished by two groups are for the most part the same, the groups cannot be said to differ. Yet the groups are not identical. They are other, as two individuals who agree may be other: each believes in filial love, and each loves another father — his own. Two religious groups may believe in freedom; each may derive that belief from a similar view of life and express that belief in

the celebration of festivals distinctive and unique. But while the first draws its inspiration from one historic experience, and the second derives inspiration from another history, they may see eye to eye with regard to the values accepted.

The distinctive and unique experiences of a group, symbolized by special events, heroes, sacred places and such, are the "sancta" of that group, the sacred associations toward which members of that group feel a special kinship, love and reverence.

Since, however, sancta are susceptible of a variety of interpretations, it is possible to find members of the same group sharing the same sancta but differing as to their values. Contemporaneous adherents of a religion may differ in their ethical valuations, invoking the same authority for both valuations.

The problem of inter-faith relations, therefore, should be approached from an entirely new point of view. We hold that the adoption of new values does not require conversion. Since ethical ideals are universal, they can be incorporated into any system and sanctified by the sancta of that system. There is no need to give up one's whole tradition, associations, social environment, sancta, if one happens to find in another religion values which are more appealing. By assimilation and appropriation, these values can be made part of one's own civilization and religion.

The mistake generally made is in thinking that a religion should be "universal" in the sense that it should be accepted by all men, that every people on earth should adopt the civilization, traditions, associations, *sancta* of that religion. The truth is that the universalism of a religion should consist in the universal applicability of its values. Missionary activity, therefore, should consist in getting others to accept one's values, not in making proselytes, in getting others to adopt one's cultural patterns or ancestors and history.

The usual objection to this conception of religion and of the relation of religions to one another is that no cognizance is taken of the fact that some religions are better than others, not only superior for their own adherents but *objectively* superior. However, upon reflection it will appear that no religion can be regarded as superior to any other. The mere fact that, at any given time in history, it may possess a superior set of values does not make the religion itself superior, since those same values can be appropriated by other religions and expressed in terms of the *sancta* of those religions. To say that the *sancta* of one religion are better than the *sancta* of another is, however, meaningless. The fact is that the *sancta* of one religion are invaluable and precious to the members of that religion: and are generally of no value at all to members of another. They may have certain purely esthetic values, but they cannot possibly have the appeal to outsiders which they have to those born and brought up within the group.

On the other hand, religious conversion, which includes the adoption of *sancta* as well as values, is a natural procedure — for those who sincerely wish to throw in their lot completely with the members of another group. If a man who for some reason has been alienated from the *sancta* of his own group, wishes to marry a member of another religious group, he should become completely assimilated into that group, provided the group acknowledges his right to interpret its *sancta* in accordance with his own conscience. He may find that the values cherished in the new group are no different from those on which he was brought up; but in the new environment, in order to express a loyalty to those values, he should talk the "language" of his new co-religionists.

As soon as we recognize, therefore, that different religious groups really represent different culture patterns, we see how futile and wrong it is to attempt to impose them upon those who prefer their own. If there is truth in a particular religion, and that truth is lacking elsewhere, it can be easily adopted and adapted and everyone will benefit.

What the Religions Must Do to Establish Peace Among Them

This approach demands a complete reorientation to the traditional faiths. Such a reorientation is as revolutionary in character as that required by the nations of the world at the present time in their attitude toward national sovereignty. Students of world affairs are coming more and more to believe that wars will never be abolished so long as nations cling to their age-old habit of regarding themselves *absolutely* independent. Unless they are prepared to recognize a universal law greater than their own, they will continue to prey upon one another. The change is so fundamental that it may require several generations to counteract nationalistic fanaticism.

In religious groups, the analogous process may be as slow. For centuries, Christians and Jews have been nourished on the belief that their religions had no choice but to extend throughout the world or perish. From now on, they must adjust themselves to their new conception, that Judaism is best for the Jews, and Christianity is best for the Christians, and Islam best for Moslems.

To achieve this new understanding, it is not enough to do what many well-wishing Christians and Jews are doing today, namely, eliminating from religious text-books all disparaging references to members of other religions. It is not enough to clear the name of the Jew from the "guilt" of the crucifixion, and it is not enough to erase derogatory references to non-Jews in Jewish texts (though they are actually few in number). Religious history must be taught in an entirely different manner. The child must be made to understand at an early age that his religion is the result of the sincere efforts of his ancestors to discover the will of God, that members of other civilizations carried on the same search, and that so long as human history goes on, the search will continue; that through it all, various cultures learn from one another, enriching each other, correcting each other. They must realize that the desire to make one religion the sole religion is as wicked and as fraught with danger as the attempt on the part of one nation to dominate all the rest and to make over the world in its own image.

We Jews are one of the smallest minorities in the United States, and are in the exposed position of being the only non-Christian group in an otherwise Christian civilization. We have seen that one of the few ideas on which divergent groups can attain unanimity is the hatred of the Jew. It therefore behooves us to take the lead in this new religious reformation. It will not be the first time that we have been called upon by the exigencies of our history and destiny to act as pioneers of new and challenging religious doctrines. Therefore, we Jews should not hesitate to incorporate the new orientation into our religious life.

What Jewish Religion Must Do

This involves the elimination from our prayerbook and our textbooks of the doctrine of the Chosen People. This doctrine has, of course, been sadly misunderstood both by Jews and by non-Jews to mean that the Jewish people is the possessor of special privileges at the hand of God. Certainly, from Biblical times to our own, being the Chosen People has

meant not privilege but responsibility. "You alone of all the peoples of the earth have I known; therefore I shall punish you for your sins." Furthermore, being a Chosen People has not meant that Israel was a closed and exclusive clan. Anyone willing to accept the beliefs and practices of the Jewish religion has always been accepted within the Jewish fold as a full-fledged Jew. In recent years, the doctrine of the Chosen People has been interpreted to mean the obligation of the Jewish people to carry out God's mission of teaching ethical monotheism to the world. And more recently, Israel's claim to be Chosen has been made to refer to the historic fact that the Jews were most influential in bringing the message of justice and peace to the civilized nations.

Yet, no matter how liberally the doctrine is taught, one basic attitude remains, and that is that the Jewish people occupies a position of *centrality* in the destiny of all the world in accordance with God's own purposes. As long as this attitude is held, the implication is that Israel possesses a unique truth not shared by other peoples.

Why is it not sufficient for Jews to be grateful to God for whatever truth has been vouchsafed to them, to seek to cultivate it to the utmost, and to strive to discover in their history and in the history of other nations the further revelation of God to man? Surely, there is enough in our heritage to make us proud to be what we are without indulging in odious comparisons between the Jewish and other civilizations.

To be sure, the elimination of the doctrine of the Chosen People will be resented both by traditional-minded Jews and by Christians. Jews will feel that it will deprive them of a psychological staff to lean on, that without it they have no genuine reason for surviving. Non-Jews will object (and have objected) because it challenges their missionizing activities, and removes religion from the arena of competition.

These objections are to be expected and should not discourage us from our purpose. They are the natural impediments to progress, and have their analogies in every phase of life, where fundamental changes are made. They will gradually diminish as men come to see that the policy of "live and let live" brings peace between religious groups and undiminished satisfaction to those who cling to their own faiths.

Education and Religion in the Home

By ASHER BLOCK

THERE are three great agencies of character building: the school, the church or synagogue, and the home — but the greatest of these is the home.

The Educational Advantages of the Home

The superior advantage of home training is due to several fundamental factors: (a) home environment is more natural (b) home influence is more regular; (c) the home can teach by example as well as precept; and (d) the home can treat the child as a complete personality. It would be well to discuss these items briefly in a general perspective, so as to apply them more forcefully to the Jewish scene.

Naturalness has been widely acclaimed in modern education. Schools pride them-

selves on being "progressive," or relating the talents of the child to the actual changing circumstances in his life; and religion today, in large measure, aims to be "practical," to answer the vital needs of the individual and society. Well, then, is there any normal situation as practically progressive as a home? Almost by definition, the ideal pedagogue or the ideal minister is the parent.

The *regularity* and continuity of family relationships is another essential consideration. The home can be, and usually is, more effective in molding a child's life than either the secular or religious school, because, in terms of adequate hours, constant personnel, and consistent handling, the home, potentially, has all the advantges.

Next is the matter of *example*. Modern advertising utilizes extensively the psychology of imitation: "Famous star smokes this cigarette"; "Millions read that magazine" — and it works! Educational or religious institutions must content themselves, in most instances, with abstraction or exhortation, but a home, in all life's intimate experiences, has, to the highest degree, the power and the privilege of setting an example.

Finally, the home alone has the possibility of answering the great need for *integration*. L. P. Jacks, in his "Education of the Whole Man," speaks of "the regeneration of man by an education adapted to his whole nature." We must help the child to see life steadily and see it whole. We must avoid the "dichotomies" of science and religion, of heaven and earth, of work and play. We have had too much of analysis and not enough of synthesis. And if the child is to get *synthetic* education, the home alone is in a position to provide it.

These things are true in education and religion in general. They are particularly true with regard to the Jewish child and the Jewish home.

Four Major Problems of Jewish Education

In teaching Judaism in America today we are confronted with at least four major problems which correspond roughly to the categories just enumerated, and, as might be surmised, their solution is bound up inextricably with the home.

First comes majority-minority relations. It is "natural" for a child in a minority group to gravitate toward the majority. Consequently, if he is to cherish unique traditions and resist popular tendency, he must have a magnetic source of moral strength and vision. The synagogue or religious school can serve this purpose, but the home even more so. In the privacy and security of a home, a family's culture is the "majority" culture. It is the *spiritual center,* in which distinctive values and forms can be preserved. Observances of the Sabbath, dietary laws, or higher ethical standards of conduct, buffeted as these may be from without, can nevertheless find anchorage from within.

To be sure, a home cannot be, nor should it attempt to be, an "island" cut off from the surrounding community. To the extent, however, that a certain detachment may at times be necessary to withstand the pressure of the world, the home can offer such "sanctuary." Having developed inner conviction and confidence, a person can then more readily participate *as an equal* in the interfaith and intercultural relations of a democracy. Thus the Biblical injunction to teach Judaism diligently to our children comes to us in logical sequence: "When thou sittest in thy house," and then "when thou walkest by the way."

Second, there is the problem of time. Our synagogues and schools must, by the very nature of things in a primary democratic civilization, function on "borrowed time." This difficulty we share with all other religious or minority cultural groups.

Some claim that the situation argues

for elementary parochial education. This writer, however, feels that the loss would be greater than the gain. In America, we cherish the things we share in common no less than the things that keep us apart. If all religious or cultural groups, in order to conserve their distinctive traits, embarked upon a program of parochialism, the essential unity of our democracy (symbolized by the public school system) would be dissolved. In a democracy, the home is an appropriate instrumentality for the maintenance of valid differences without jeopardizing the broader unity. It remains for the Jewish home, therefore, to make up in time, regularity, and intensity what the other Jewish agencies perforce leave undone.

Third, Judaism sorely needs good, concrete *examples.* No one will gainsay the value of an ideology or rationale, but most of the anti-religious Jews I have met have become so not through philosophical doubt but from unpleasant experience. A home where the Sabbath is a drudgery through endless prohibitions is a dialectic much more powerful than a host of brilliant interpretations and rationalization. Or, one may stress religious pluralism in education and the democratic virtue of respecting minority cultures, yet if a child is captivated by the beauty and pageantry of Christmas while Hanukkah is drab and uninspiring, Hanukkah simply does not stand a chance. Gladstone said: "One example is worth a thousand arguments." The movies are so powerful an influence because, ostensibly, they neither teach nor preach; they simply tell a story and set examples of "heroes" and "heroines." In the final test, Jewish values will survive only by the vivid and contagious example that one generation shall be able to set for another.

Last, is the matter of coordination and *integration.* In our present educational order, the public schools teach elements of general knowledge, such as arithmetic, geography, music, world history, science, hygiene, etc., plus courses of specifically American content, as English grammar and literature, American history and civics, and so on. The church or synagogue, on the other hand, instructs in areas of religion which the separation of church and state, as applied to the American school system, precludes. Here, too, the training has universalistic and particularistic aspects: humanitarian ethics, world-wide ideals, and the worth of individual personality; plus denominational studies, modes of worship, and systems of ritual.

Realistically, life cannot be so departmentalized. Every normal life situation has in it both the secular and the spiritual, the particular and the universal. Somewhere all the strings must be tied together! Where, then, but in the home?

Surely this imposes a momentous responsibility on parents. In truth, they are expected to be philosophers, psychologists, and paragons of virtue—all in one. Yet the challenge is there, and cannot be evaded. The home is the focus at which all the forces of culture and civilization meet. The home is the ultimate laboratory for the achievement of character. To paraphrase a popular advertisement: when finer human beings are made, the home will make them!

This emphasis upon the tremendous importance of parental guidance is not to be construed, of course, as exempting the synagogue or religious school from their share in character training. On the contrary, if these are to attain their avowed objectives, they must educate parents to their accountability, and help equip them, through adult institutes and parents' associations, for their crucial role.

Religious Values Fostered by the Jewish Home

Because of its thoroughgoing influence, the attitudes generally fashioned in the

home are basic and enduring. In the intimate and unrehearsed relationships of a family, children will absorb impressions, feelings, and emotions that will deeply color their lives, such as of love or hate, of strife or cooperation, of faith or fear, of good will or prejudice, of persuasion or force, of authoritarianism or democracy.

Our special interest lies in the religious values which should permeate a Jewish home and which, through the dynamic factors mentioned above, should be transmitted to the children. Essentially there are four such preeminent values or attitudes: awareness of God, respect for personality, love of *Torah,* and eagerness for *mitzvot.*

1. *Awareness of God* involves the art of praying. A home wherein there is no prayer — namely, a conscious recognition of the presence of God, and communion with Him — can be considered neither Jewish nor religious in any fundamental sense. We are not thinking, of course, of ancient, stereotyped formulas but rather of a *spirit of prayer* in the home, such as: expressed gratitude, morning and night, for the gift of life and its possibilities; blessings before and after meals; the pronouncing of a *berachah* (either in traditional manner or in sentiments to that effect) over the peal of thunder, the aroma of spice, or the sight of trees in bloom; the conversational use of phrases like "God forbid" or "with God's help" applied to ethical situations; a general outlook of courage in the face of difficulty, morality in temptation, etc.

"A person should utter a hundred benedictions a day," says one Rabbinic tradition. This number is anything but an exaggeration if we deem every positive religious thought, expression, act, and mood a "benediction." Such intensity is simply the awareness of God—in earnest. Spirituality should not be a mere holiday affair, but a natural "routine" of everyday life — in regular family devotions, in religious "etiquette" at the table, in attendance at synagogue worship together, in frank and honest answers to children's questions about God, about death, about Jewishness, and in intimate contact with the rabbi and the religious life of the community.

Every person, according to a Jewish proverb, has three partners in life: God, father and mother. For the sake of the spiritual and moral health of the coming generations, let us not dissolve that partnership.

2. *Respect for personality* is also grounded in the home. Attitudes toward fellow human beings are thoroughly tested in simple family relationships, of husband and wife, of parent and child, of individual and neighbor. *Sh'lom bayit*—peace of the home—is among the highest religious ideals, and involves a multitude of sensitivities and disciplines. It demands of parents patience with one another and with the children, honesty and sincerity in all their dealings, and, above all, a willingness to reason things out when there is a difference of opinion.

Equally significant are attitudes toward non-members of the family. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is almost a platitude in religious parlance, until applied to the Cohens, the Browns, or the McCarthys next door! Actual relations leave their mark upon the minds and hearts of children more than do Biblical quotations. The tone of voice in which you say *goy* or *shikseh*; how you treat the maid or day-worker that comes to your house; your "group references" to Negroes, Arabs, Germans or fellow-Jews—these constitute your day-by-day man-to-man religion (or lack of it) and nowhere does that count more than in the presence or audience of your child.

Democracy, too, begins at home. Does

a sense of human equality pervaded domestic relations? Is unfair preference shown toward one child as against another, toward one sex as against the other? Is every one in the household granted a rightful share of privileges and responsibilities?

The home is a microcosm—a miniature of the world at large with its problems and opportunities. Religion and democracy must first become realities there, if they are to find meaning and permanence within a family of nations.

3. *Love of Torah,* in Judaism, is the intellectual application of the love of God and man, and, as such, was the dominating passion in all ages of Jewish life. It was the study of God's law so that man might live an exalted life. Broadly interpreted, Torah ought to mean for us a religious zeal for education and wisdom. In the Jewish home, it might embrace manifestations as the following: regular study of the Bible and Jewish classics, periods set aside for serious and worthwhile reading, attendance of children at religious Hebrew Schools, attendance of parents at lecture courses and participation in parents-teachers conferences, the building of a Jewish bookshelf in the home, subscription to important periodicals, support of religious and cultural institutions, and a keen interest in the children's intellectual and moral problems.

4. *Eagerness for Mitzvot* is the conscious will and desire to translate Torah into action. The *Mishnah* enumerates some of the things that rank high as equivalents of the all-important study of Torah: honoring father and mother, the practise of lovingkindness, visiting the sick, attending the dead, making peace between man and his fellow, etc. No Jew today could honestly hope to carry out the traditional 613 *mitzvot* in their original form and context, but the historic Jewish desire for doing "good deeds" must not be lost to ourselves, to our children, or to the world. We must place unlimited emphasis in contemporary Jewish living upon *the spirit of mitzvah performance,* and that performance must be dedicated to *Kiddush Hashem,* the hallowing of the spirit of God in the world.

Ritual and Symbols in the Home

In the transfer of these values from parent to child, rituals and symbols are of immense educational aid, since they evoke curiosity and discussion. The question-answer technique employed so successfully at the Passover *Seder* should be applied, in effect, to every other aspect of Jewish religious life. "And it shall be when thy son asketh thee, saying: What is this? that thou shalt say unto him. . . .!" Here is the crux of the whole educational process in its most natural and significant form—the child asks; the parent answers. Every ritual thus becomes a pedagogic point of reference. When a child sees the father put on *tefillin* or the mother light candles, he will ask, *Why?* That *Why* is an invitation to teach. To turn it down, or even to pass it by, is to miss a glorious opportunity.

Symbols should have the same significance in the home as have maps or diagrams in a classroom. To have a *mezuzah,* for instance, on display without knowing why it is there, is tantamount to owning a book and never reading it. The ultimate justification of any symbolism is the meaning or interpretation attached to it. This thought is clearly expressed in the Bible in connection with the wearing of "fringes" or a *talit*: "that ye may look upon it, and remember all the commandments of the Lord, and do them . . . and be holy unto your God."

Herein perhaps resides one of the "blessings in disguise" of being a minority religion or culture. A member of the

majority seldom finds it necessary to ask himself why certain things are done—say, saluting the flag or wearing a necktie. Such things are taken for granted and become a matter of course, simply because "most people do them." Not so with a minority. They are continually challenged, if only by contrary example, when they digress from popular trend. In the long run, therefore, whatever survives of Judaism in a democratic social environment will, in all likelihood, be there, not through sheer habit or historic momentum, but by virtue of its inherent appeal and reason.

Our interest in religious progress can best be served by assuring the fact that nothing within our heritage which has such appeal and reason shall be lost to our people or to mankind.

The Centrality of Fund Raising*

By GERSHON GELBART

EVEN a superficial glance at developments in organized Jewish community life in America, within recent years, will reveal the remarkable progress achieved in reference to its democratic character. Whereas in the past, communal leadership was concentrated in the hands of a few — whether by preemption or by default — of late, both the personnel and the policies governing community life have tended more and more to be determined by an increasingly active and vital body of participants. No doubt, world events and parallel developments in the American body politic have exercised a powerful influence. The appeal to "the forgotten man" or "the little man" for his political support — an appeal which has met with a far-reaching response — has found its counterpart on the Jewish scene. Much the same way as the average American has enlarged his narrow interests, which had been centered in his lodge, church or club, to embrace the country or, at least, his own community, so, too, the average Jew has awakened to the existence of communal, if not national, interests.

Fund Raising an Expression of the Jewish Heart

No one will deny that the advent of Hitlerism abroad and of the various "echo-movements" in America has acted as a powerful alarum upon the average Jew in this country. The fear-reaction which it created could not, however, in itself be productive of any positive values. Civic-protective organizations did, of course, receive a new impetus. To some extent, elementary educational institutions also benefited from this hysteria, as did the Zionist movement, at least financially. All this did not, however, constitute progress, since the underlying impulse was not one of forging ahead so much as of going back, a return to old, almost forgotten patterns — an escapist movement, in essence. Thus the revival of interest in religious education, for instance, was oriented toward old-fashioned "old home" Orthodoxy, resulting in a new crop of educational institutions patterned on European models.

The emergence of an interest on the part of the average Jew in communal activity was due then, indirectly, to the

* We publish this article as a lucid statement of a point of view on an important public issue. This does not mean that we endorse the opinions of the author. We invite comment from our readers.—*Editors.*

spectre of Hitlerism whose shadow bestrode the continents. Yet what stimulated and channeled that interest was not the fear-reflex but, rather, the concomitant need for aid for European Jewry, the demand for practical work on a level which was peculiarly American. It is obvious that the greatest single response that the catastrophic condition of the Jewish people has evoked in American Jewry has been in the field of fund raising. The appeal for funds was something which the American Jew understood and upon which he was willing to act. Devoid, by and large, of any deep Jewish learning or insight, untrained and unwilling to become involved in the maze of parties and ideologies, he was eager, nonetheless, to lend a helping hand in the vast humanitarian undertaking on behalf of rescue and relief. Whatever else he may lack, the American Jew has a heart.

Fund Raising a Unifying Influence

Raising funds was not a new experience for the Jewish community in America. Ever since the First World War, impressive efforts have been made to mobilize the financial resources of American Jewry, especially through the Joint Distribution Committee. Earlier still, in fact since the first days of the Jewish settlement in this country, much significant activity had been carried on for the support of local charities. But the new need, which descended like a sledge-hammer upon the consciousness of American Jewry, posed problems of such unprecedented magnitude and urgency as to render old methods and old approaches obsolete. The basic stubborn fact was the vastness of the sums required. The leadership faced the situation with courage and, on the whole, with integrity. It realized that "the few," who in the past had contributed the bulk of the Federation-type of charity and were therefore in control, could not possibly raise the funds needed out of their own resources and that, consequently, it would have to go to "the masses." And although not necessarily democratic by nature, it was aware of the lesson of democracy which teaches that in order to win popular support, in a voluntary movement such as this, it is necessary to yield some of the control to the representatives of the people. What followed is history, and a milestone in the annals of Jewish philanthropy.

Primarily, the success of this nationwide fund raising venture must be ascribed to the tradition of giving which is so deeply rooted in the Jewish people. And it is not by way of belittling this ethical motivation that an investigation into some of the other underlying factors is pursued.

American Jewry Comes of Age

There can be little quarrel with the thesis that in the interval between the two world wars, between the organization of the Joint Distribution Committee and of the United Jewish Appeal, the Jewish masses of America had come of age. The generation that served in the ranks of the A.E.F., or was attending school during the First World War, had meanwhile grown to maturity as a self-confident, fully Americanized, democratically-minded Jewry. The children of the immigrants from Eastern Europe had arrived, politically as well as economically. And so when the emergency arose, they were fully prepared to furnish the leadership as well as the funds.

The U.J.A., or the even more comprehensive appeals on the local level, such as the Jewish Welfare Funds, the "combined," "united" or "allied" appeals, were not the products of an ideological meeting of minds. They were the creature of convenience, not of conviction—

mere by-products of the technique of fund raising. The urgency of economy—economy of personnel, time and expense—was among the potent arguments that won the day for a unified effort. But once the moneys were raised in this joint effort, they had to be distributed somehow. And so the problems of budgeting and allocation made their appearance. The adherents of the various causes represented in the joint campaign met together, listened to each other's cases and, willy-nilly, learned the great lesson of compromise. At the same time they also learned another lesson, one that they had not set out deliberately to learn. In the course of all this bargaining and working out of practical solutions in the smoke-filled conference rooms, they came face to face with the needs and requirements of the various beneficiary organizations as well as with their underlying philosophies. This exposure to Jewish ideas and movements on the part of "hard-headed" business-men is likely to prove one of the most lasting effects of the welfare fund movement. In some instances, the practical men and women of the allocations committees and of the governing bodies received their first instalment of a real Jewish education through the "project method" of fund raising on behalf of the *total* Jewish community. People who in the past were all too prone to hurl at each other such epithets as "assimilationist," "c o m m u n i s t," "un-American," "atheist," "chauvinist" and the like, now forged out of their common experience a new fellowship of community service and community leadership within the democratic framework of unity in variety.

The gain to the community did not express itself on the leadership level alone. Communal institutions of long standing, some of them suffering from a progressive ossification process or bearing the stigma of vested interests, became revitalized by contact with this fresh and uninhibited leadership. Mergers, regroupings, streamlining and even liquidation of existing agencies,—as well as the establishment of new ones in the light of demonstrated needs, have created, in some instances, a new functional pattern in the community and placed the entire social service structure on a sounder financial basis. Not the least among these developments is the assumption of communal responsibility for Jewish education in an ever-growing number of communities.

Fund Raising Recruits—
New Personnel for Jewish Service

The quickening of the pulse of community life has had its repercussions in the life of local organizational activity. It is not surprising that some of these new communal leaders should have come from the various local organizations. Thus the congregations, the community centers, the Talmud Torahs, the Zionist groups, B'nai B'rith and other fraternal lodges,—have contributed to this pool some of their veteran workers who — and this too is not surprising—did not always bring with them a spirit of tolerance and compromise. The bulk of the new leadership came, however, from sources hitherto untapped — young business and professional men who had previously shied away from factional embroilments and who, moreover, had been regarded by the old-guard leadership as Jewishly ignorant and indifferent. Their dormant enthusiasm, American know-how and deep-seated Jewish loyalty had remained an unused resource, until it became harnessed to the over-all fund raising effort. In their new roles they constituted a non-partisan element, representing the American Jew who had no overmastering affiliations and owed previous allegiance to no one. And because they were able to "produce," in the sense that their tasks required, their

influence grew steadily. With it came the spirit of a moratorium on factionalism. This spirit was reflected,, at first, only in out-voting the partisan interests, but later suceeded in infecting the partisans themselves with an attitude of community loyalty and mutual tolerance.

In time, fresh opportunities for service came to these workers, for the various local organizations, eager to take advantage of their talents for finance and administration, gradually invited them into their inner councils. Many a congregation, many a Zionist District has received a new lease on life with the coming of these men, some of whom have shown great promsie not only as administrators and membership-getters but as leaders with spiritual and intellectual powers of a high order. Any recent roster of leadership of national organizations will yield upon examination a sizeable percentage of individuals who have come up through the local Welfare Funds and Community Councils.

On the national level, too, the influence of leaders recruited through fund raising has made itself felt. The cry for unity which has recently been heard on the Jewish scene with a growing insistence has come from these men who were trained in communal unity. In the American Jewish Conference and in the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, particularly in the latter, voices have been raised, vigorously and resolutely, for a coordinated, business-like and effective program of Jewish acitivity on a national scale. To an ever-higher degree, the budgets and, therefore, the very existence of many a national organization will depend on the goodwill and support of the local communities. And as these realize the full meaning of their new-found strength, they are certain to assert themselves and to demand that the wastefulness of overlapping, and of institutional rivalry be eliminated. Having succeeded in this respect on a local level, the chances are strong that they will be equally successful where the national interests are involved.

"Secularizing" Jewish Leadership

The infusion of this new blood into the stream of Jewish communal life has had many other effects. Among other things, it has had the effect of "secularizing" Jewish leadership. In the past, much of the communal activity had been concentrated in the hands of the rabbis and the professional educational and social workers. Leadership proper, in a democracy, is not a profession. Technical and spiritual guidance are the prerogative of the trained worker, but moral and political leadership, of any abiding significance, can come only from the so-called "layman." For too long the professional worker, especially the rabbi, had occupied the limelight in the Jewish community. Well-intentioned as he no doubt was, his leadership in communal affairs served, in the long run, to alienate the community from communal affairs, for it was, in fact, a leadership without a following. The reasons for this are not too difficult to guess. In the first place, leadership, to be effective, must be "native," must be part and parcel of the community, permanent. Rabbis and other professional workers were not, as a rule, permanent fixtures of any one community. And while the communities frequently did the bidding of their rabbis, they did not actually "follow" them. The national scene was, in reality, a stage upon which the actors performed, while the audience — what there was of it — merely footed the bill. At national conferences and conventions, the rabbi was very much in evidence. And while in his zeal for national causes, he traveled the length

and the breadth of the country, drawing applause and building up his own stature, his community stayed behind, no doubt taking pride in his triumphs but essentially unaffected by the issues involved. These conditions created oratory aplenty, and brilliant slogans, but very little leadership.

It should be borne in mind that the *raison d'etre* of the rabbi's office was not communal activity. He was not the officer elected for that purpose, and his rise and fall did not depend on how accurately he was reflecting the views and sentiments of his congregation in matters of national policy. He was neither responsive to those sentiments nor was he responsible to anyone for his own views. When challenged on this score, he would be apt to point out that his expression of opinion came under the heading of freedom of speech.

Again, in many communities the rabbi was the only one who was capable of speaking for the community both because of his knoweldge of the Jewish and non-Jewish scene and his training in forensics. He was actually the mouthpiece, even if he spoke for no one but himself. But even if potential lay leadership was available, this did not essentially alter the situation. For so long as the rabbi was the ex-officio head of the community, the layman could not hope to attain the acme of leadership, a condition which was not calculated to encourage the able and the ambitious.

Much as it is to be regretted, it is yet unavoidable that rabbis and other professional workers, having as they do a deeper insight into Jewish problems, should frequently be at odds as to basic matters of policy. What community has been spared, at one time or another, the spectacle and tragedy of internal strife precipitated by its professional leaders? To genuine differences of opinion were added other factors such as personal rivalry and congregational politics, which did not help to boost the prestige of self-respect of the local community. Nor was this always confined to the local community. Ultimately, the national causes themselves were made to suffer, for the average person has little stomach for ideological squabbles and is likely to attribute them to sordid partisan politics.

The new "fund raising" leadership has been able to overcome many of these handicaps. Having its roots in the community, whatever progress it makes eventually trickles down to all layers of the community. The position of leadership held by these individuals is not accidental or an *ex-officio* appanage; it is an elective one and they must, therefore, keep their ear close to the ground in order to stay in power. True, when they speak for their communities, eloquence may not be among their qualifications, but if they lack the orator's gusto, they possess the businessman's taste for facts, thus injecting a new note into public deliberations. And in the final analysis, it is only their own ability and their sensitiveness to the needs and the views of their community, together with their desire to serve, that will determine how far they will get in the hierarchy of leadership.

Above all, they have no professional axe to grind. Their livelihood and economic advancement do not depend on the showing they can make in competition with other workers. They are, therefore, apt to be more tolerant of differences and will not wring their hands over minor ideological inconsistencies.

The layman who was thus catapulted into the position of leadership did not rise to power on a platform of opposition to the professional leader. It was only because the special conditions placed a premium on his type of competence that he emerged at all. The assumption of

leadership by the layman does not therefore, relegate the rabbi and the professional worker to a subordinate position. On the contrary, it gives the latter an opportunity to employ his training and ability to the greatest advantage. He can be the power behind the throne. For there can be no more rewarding labor than the guidance and stimulation of the leaders of the community. There is less resistance to ideas articulated by a layman than to those same ideas when presented by a "highbrow." And the education thus received by the lay leadership will eventually color the thinking of the entire community.

Will Fund Raising Remain the Central Communal Activity?

Are these developments indicative of the pattern of the Jewish community structure, at least in the near future? Will the centrality of fund raising continue?

Historically, the Jewish community has gone through a number of phases. When it enjoyed complete autonomy, its functions included every department of life. At times it exercised legal authority over the religious life of the community. At other times, as in the early days in America, its main concern was with relief and charity. Today, the community exercises no governmental functions and few of the traditional ones. Such areas as local relief and health are increasingly being taken over by government agencies. It now retains only two functions which are universally conceded to transcend the multitude of factional interests: the protective activity *vis-a-vis* anti-Semitism, and joint fund raising. The fight against anti-Semitism and discrimination, while admittedly a necessary function, is not conducive, at least not in its present popular conception, to the creation of positive values. Fund raising, on the other hand, has profound implications. The selfless work on behalf of overseas rescue and rehabilitation, financed by it, is in itself capable of creating profound loyalties and feelings of allegiance. The financing of local community needs through joint fund raising is an education in democracy.

Thus the practical work and the very tangible achievements involved in fund raising hold great promise. American Jewry has demonstrated, time and again, that while it can collaborate on a practical basis, it is too fragmentized, too diversified economically and socially, to unite on an ideological platform. Compare the encouraging and increasingly vocal demand for unity in action, emanating from the General Assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, which represents local "practical" comunities, with the hesitant voice of the American Jewish Conference, straining to speak for American Jewry as clustered around its national "ideological" organizations. In this connection, it is worth noting the comparative absence of rabbinical names from the roster of delegates to the General Assembly.

If another illustration is needed to emphasize the compatibility of American Jewry in the realm of practical work, in contrast to the ideological and political fields, a glance at the admirable achievements of Hadassah, both in local communities and nationally, and the ineffectiveness and floundering of the Z.O.A. will suffice.

The trends displayed by recent developments on the Jewish scene receive further confirmation when thrown against the background of the general American scene. Viewed against his natural environment, the American Jew is seen merely to reflect the general American tendency. Many a foreigner expresses his amazement at the way Americans disagree among themselves on any and all subjects and yet are able to accomplish so much in

the realm of practical work. It is very difficult as any day's mail can prove — to set up in this country one over-all organization for a single aim. No sooner does one appear than others burst upon the scene, each intent on doing more or less the same thing. Even the various branches of government — federal, state and local — frequently compete with each other in the same fields, as witness the tangle in the service-to-the-veteran setup. On the other hand, attention must be drawn to the phenomenal growth of community chests in the past twenty years, from fifty-odd to some thousand today. This same spirit has manifested itself in the activities of the Red Cross and other volunteer wartime agencies.

Certain conclusions are forced on us by a consideration of developments in the field of community leadership. One applies to the exploitation of the personnel thus created. No one will venture to predict what financial demands will be made upon us in the future. It is conceivable, however, that those demands may decline and that we may, consequently, through disuse, lose the services of the vast personnel which has been built up during the recent crisis. It is incumbent particularly upon the professional leadership of the community — the rabbi, the educator and the social worker — to retain their hold on these individuals, and to introduce them, through the "project method" wherever possible, to the deeper meanings of Jewish life. For the professional worker, this is a challenge and a golden opportunity.

Great inroads have been made into the wall of apathy and indifference of the average Jew by the practical implications of the last decade of Jewish misery. Even the least sensitive among them has come forward — it took a little pushing, to be sure — with an offer to help, with a few dollars if with nothing else. We must not look down upon this token participation in Jewish life. If we but learn how to make use of it, souls can be salvaged.

The centrality of fund raising in Jewish community life may in time be supplanted by some other function that will come to the fore. But we shall be taking a step backward and not forward if we dismiss this present preoccupation with finances as a necessary but passing evil, and fail to recognize it for what it is: the genuine expression of the peculiar genius of the Jewish community in America.

There is a good deal of talk about the "dual loyalty" with which Jewish citizens of other countries will be faced after the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth. I, who know what is in my heart, tell you that this is nonsense. I was born in London fifty-two years ago: I was educated at Oxford: I am writing this by an open window that looks out over a Berkshire lane. Do you imagine that I love what Wells has called "the great rain-swept heart of the modern world," or New College garden, or the grass and sweet briar outside my window, any less because I long, now that the war is over, to see the wild flowers of a Palestine spring? Do you think that I am the less proud to inherit, with forty-eight million other Englishmen, the English tradition of freedom, merely because I am proud also of the social justice and unselfish cooperation which have been achieved in the collective colonies of Palestine? Do I feel Shelley and Wordsworth and Blake the less mine, because Isaiah and Ezekiel speak to me with a peculiarly personal and a peculiarly intimate message? England need never feel afraid, whether before or after the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth, about the loyalty of her Jewish citizens: and least of all about the loyalty of those who are as proud to be Jews as they are proud to be Englishmen, and proud in both cases with a pride based, not on any narrow chauvinism, but on their membership of a community which has already done something, however little, for the benefit of humanity, and is called upon to do far more in the years and centuries ahead

—Victor Gollancz, "Nowhere to Lay Their Heads."